

Jatiwangi
artFactory

PARIRIMBON
JATI
WANGI
G

‘SIASAT’ – Artistic Tactics for Transgression on State Authority

Ellen Kent and Frans Ari Prasetyo

ellydotkent@gmail.com
fransariprasetyo@gmail.com

Introduction

The 15th Jakarta Biennale’s curatorial premise, *Siasat* (Tactic) identified artists and art works which demonstrated how individuals and communities, especially in urban Indonesia, cope with social inequality, environmental pressure, and poverty. The resulting biennale, which consisted of a large main exhibition in the underground car park at Taman Ismail Marzuki, and further projects across Jakarta city, also included a number of projects that were implemented primarily outside of gallery and museum spaces altogether.

The city is a spatial unit that serves particular functions for capital and at the same time forms a site for class struggle. Precisely at that meeting point, efforts to translate the reality of the city become important. Hence the experience of the urban environment today includes particular practices of *siasat* by communication through diverse relationships. The notion of public space as a highly localized, historical, social condition is brought together with contemporary networks of practitioner in art, literature, music and activism.

Curatorial and artistic engagement with the Biennale’s premise resulted in art works and projects that resonated with recent scholarship around relational aesthetics and participatory art practices. The scholarship of theorists such as Bishop, Kester, Bourriaud, Kwon and others has highlighted the emergence of practices that demand a greater level of audience participation than traditional artworks, creating new spaces for interaction in public and private realms, critiquing the dominant paradigmatic relationships between individuals, groups, corporations and the state, and imagining new ways of living. There are many points of disagreement around the aesthetic and social aspects of these practices, not least of which is the proposal that many such projects inadvertently fulfil the desires of neo-conservative government to transfer state responsibility for social and environmental problems to society. We will examine how the intentions of two artists collectives’ separate and joint acts of ‘resistance’ complicate the paradigm of neo-conservative transferral of responsibility in the contemporary Indonesian context, indicating the potential, productive tensions that arise between working in society with and without the state.

To do so we foreground the work of two artist run social initiatives who were involved in the 15th Jakarta Biennale. The first is Jatiwangi Arts Factory (JaF), from a semi-rural industrial town in West Java, where until recently the principle economic basis was the roof-tile industry. The second is Trotoart, who operate in the densely populated, frequently flooded area of Penjaringan in Jakarta. These two collectives work separately with communities in their own vicinity, but for the Biennale they collaborated on the building of a futsal field under a flyover in Penjaringan, north Jakarta, re-mapping the geography of centres and margins. This new political space then surpassed cultural politics and identity, although the seeds of these new identities are already sown. The territorial differences between JaF and Trotoart were sublimated into one art practice, in the context of the Biennale, invoking new

contestations and processes of participation.

The first under discussion look at is JaF's *Festival Masa Depan (Future Festival)*. Through the festival JaF implemented a participatory urban planning process in their local community, utilising art and artists as a medium for the construction of social capital, and then rolling outcomes from the process into the Factory's own programming. Their approach, both generally and through the *Festival Masa Depan*, signifies an application of endogenous development principles both through social interactions and artistic production.

JaF and Trotoart's joint project for the Jakarta Biennale was titled *12 x 30m Persegi Di Sebelah Kecepatan (12 x 30m Rectangle Beside the Speed, henceforth referred to as 12 x 30m)*. The culmination of months of planning and negotiation, the final project involved the clearing of a small piece of land beside the tollway, for the purposes of building a publicly accessible futsal (mini-soccer) field. The reclamation of this space from numerous stakeholders reproduced it as "public space", intervening on the *ad hoc* spatial arrangements that had been legitimised by the absence of the state.

Finally, Trotoart has been able to exploit *12x30m* by utilising the space to plan a year long program of activities for local residents in Penjaringan; *Bermartabat dengan Trotoart*, which returns us to the questions that we will set out early in our discussion. The field itself is an artwork in the process of transformation from spatial tactic to a social strategy; exploiting the convolutions of bureaucracy from the outside in order to achieve what seemed impossible from within. Does this ameliorative outcome absolve the authorities of their responsibility, or could it instead transfer a kind of autonomous authority to those who have produced the artwork, the community and the artists?

Jatiwangi Art Factory (JaF) and Trotoart; a brief background

Jatiwangi Arts Factory runs community-oriented art programs from a tile factory and home in a semi-rural area of West Java, with broad aims to develop discourses around local, rural life through arts and cultural activities such as festivals, performances, visual art, music, video, ceramics, exhibitions, artist residencies, monthly discussions, radio broadcasts and education programs. Their perspective is defiantly village oriented, although they approach this from a sophisticated and deceptively organised framework. From their base in Jatisura hamlet they run a radio station, a popular rock band that uses instruments entirely made from ceramics, and run regular community oriented festivals and art programs. Founded in 2005, since 2008 JaF has been working together with the village level government to conduct social research through contemporary art. This collaboration seems to manifest largely in the legitimising presence of key figures of the local government within JaF's collective. The sub district head (better known as Pak Camat) features frequently in video works, performances and musicals, and at events; he even recorded a song of his own creation with the JaF resident band Hanyaterra. Importantly, one of JaF's founding members is Ginggi Hasyim, better known as Pak Kuwu, presently village head of Jatisura hamlet, under whose leadership the neighbourhood has seen considerable change in terms of local culture and environmental awareness (Tri Irawaty, 2013). JaF are used to playing somewhere between government and provocateur; as well as counting the local village head and the subdistrict chief as core members, but also often push back at the state designated future of their area, which is set to be overshadowed by the building of a toll road and international airport in the near future.

One of the most significant aspects of JaF's activity is their residency program, which

invites Indonesian and international artists to conduct art projects that engage with the local community. This injection of cosmopolitanism exposes residents to diverse cultural and social influences, fundamentally altering the nature of the otherwise homogenous community. Through 'imported' imagination JaF provokes change and seeks to explain relationships of domination and contestation. Importantly, JaF's methodology insists that resident artists produce participatory art practices that accord with the everyday life of the community.

Trotoart is an artist's community who live and work with the occupants of legal and illegal settlements in the Jakarta's frequently flooded northern area of Penjaringan. Through their *Bermartabat Bersama Trotoart* program, they run creative classes, workshops and discussion groups. According to founding member, painter Jhoni Patriarik Karlah—the only remaining founding member—Trotoart was originally established as 'purely artistic'. They have had periods of dormancy over the years—perhaps largely because until recently, they lacked an economic or geographic base. With a core group of around five or six members at any one time, in its early days, Trotoart operated within the normal conventions of artist practice, focussing on the production of visual artworks such as paintings, and mutual support for each other's artistic practice. However, over the years there was a shift not in the goals of the organisation, but rather in the practices, and individuals involved.¹

This increasing orientation to the public reflects a broader trend across Java and internationally, where artists position themselves as cultural, political and social mediators between the public and the state, the public and the market, or the public and modernity/globalisation/post-coloniality.

Having operated in this social milieu, interacting directly with the public through programs designed for their benefit, for over a decade, Trotoart has continued to develop its programs without external funding, and also, until recently, without legal status.

Nonetheless, Trotoart has a gradually developing influence on the youth of Penjaringan, and the area now boasts two more arts collectives that are oriented towards public interaction, who also participated in the *12x30m* project. As of the middle of 2014, Trotoart is now recognised officially as the *Yayasan Trotoart Semesta Raya* (Trotoart Universe Foundation), and this situation is not unrelated to the outcomes of *12 x 30m*.

A Brief Context for Participatory Art Practice in Indonesia

The history of this kind of activity in Indonesia stems back at least to the early days of the nation's founding and independence, when artists were inscribed by political leaders, and inscribed themselves, as the key to imagining the boundaries of the new nation and culture. Painter Soedjojono, known as the father of modern Indonesian painting, famously called on the 'painters of Indonesia²' (demonstrating strong revolutionary sentiment, given that the archipelago was still at that time known as the Dutch East Indies or Hindia Belanda) to return to the subjects of social life in Indonesia, and particularly the suffering of the people under colonialism. (Holt, 1967, p.195-96) A pre-independence exhibition space, Pusat Tenaga Rakyat (Centre For People's Power, or PUTRA) was founded by, among others later, first president Sukarno and pioneering pedagogist Kyai Hadjar Dewantara, where many prominent artists of the period, especially painters, exhibited their work. In the 1950s and 60s, the Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat (The Institute of People's Culture, or LEKRA) espoused socialist realist creative practice and dictated methodologies to achieve this, which included the practice of *turba* (*turun ke bawah*), or immersing oneself "below" with the *rakyat*, the people. All throughout this period the tradition

1 Interview with Jhoni Patriarik and Peter, 17 July 2014.
2 The phrase 'artists of Indonesia' demonstrates strong revolutionary sentiment, given that the archipelago was still at that time known as the Dutch East Indies or Hindia Belanda.

of the *sanggar*, or what we might recognise as an atelier, continued, with artists gathering formally or informally to share skills and mentor emerging artists.

After the tragic events of 1965, LEKRA was disbanded; its association with the Indonesian Communist Party meant many members were “disappeared”, murdered, jailed or exiled. Many other creative practitioners not associated with LEKRA but known for their sympathy towards the poor or for their ‘rakyat’ oriented themes, suffered the same fate. As a consequence of this, artistic practice in Indonesia for the first time entered a phase where social criticism or engagement with social issues barely ever occurred. In this period abstraction, abstract expressionism, geometric art and calligraphic art all advanced in Indonesia. In the 1970s some resistance to this disconnection between the experience of ordinary life and the imagery produced by artists occurred, led by artists in collectives such as *Desember Hitam* (Black December), PIPA (*Seni Kepribadian Apa*-or What Identity Art) and GSRB (*Gerakan Seni Rupa Baru* or the New Visual Art Movement), who not only sought to return the subject matter of art to social issues, but did so through exploration of new mediums such as the found objects, installation and performance³. In the 1990s, this focus became even more pronounced, as organisations such as Taring Padi, and individual artists such as Tisna Sanjaya and Moelyono, sought to voice opposition to the despotic New Order regime, particularly through activating, educating and collaborating with groups they saw as particularly marginalised; farmers, labourers, and rural communities.

In 1998, with the end of Suharto’s regime and the beginning of the Reformation era in Indonesia, art was often used as an alternative media in order to articulate responses to political, social and economic conditions. Artists took part in this action through their works, such as illustrations, posters, comics, installation art, graffiti, and street theatre. Public space was the preferred venue for such art, as its function was as a public activity or expression, so that it was considered a perfect place to share the message behind the artworks (Darmawan, 2013). However, during that time art in public space was not only intended to create public awareness of existing issues, but also as a deliberate rejection of the formal sphere of art, which was in the grip of elitism, labelling, and excessive materialism in the Suharto period.

These art actions were often implemented through specific works that were presented to the public in less exclusive forums than gallery spaces. Public space was the site of choice, because of its function as a public expression or artistic activity, and so public space was the perfect site to share the message behind the art works. However, these practices aimed not only to create public awareness about existing issues, but also to deliberately reject the formal art world, which by virtue of its elitist domination over categories and materials, had become the ‘enemy’. Here art practice seems to be an adaptation to particular conditions in contemporary society, already underway long before, through activism within the art work and the behaviour of artists. Activism results in particular practices in producing participatory creativity, as well as articulating different images or voices in particular communities. Methods for capturing chronological narratives of the social condition are used to build the potential of space, ideas, viruses and infections as they occur in society. Interconnections between art practices and the community continuously produce resonances with the practice of everyday life. Activism through art practice was initially based on personal contact that reproduced the self, echoing global resonances that touch on the collective experience of activating local knowledge within the global paradigm.

There is of course plenty of scope to critique the assumptions that organisations and individuals make when they evoke the ‘rakyat’ or ‘go down’ to the people.

Rural communities do tend to bear the blunt end of the modernisation and industrialisation stick, their land often expropriated by commercial interests, their livelihoods threatened by the changing climate, unscrupulous mining, deforestation and plantation⁴. Nonetheless, artists also often seem to make a tenuous link between physical labour and marginalisation; rarely do we see the down-trodden street seller, or the exploited and underpaid school teacher depicted as part of the noble, impoverished *rakyat*. Furthermore, if the people, or the *rakyat* are primarily or exclusively represented for artists from Soedjojono to Taring Padi by the lower-working classes, then who is everybody else? If artists must “go down” to the level of the *rakyat*, then how do they legitimise their own existence and that of their peers—which society do they belong to? Although there is no space in this article to properly deconstruct the notion of *turba* and its assumptions around social class, knowledge and power, these earlier forms of socially oriented practices provide an interesting counter-point to the projects under discussion here, in that the work of JaF and Trotoart is located where the protagonist artists’ live, in and amongst their own communities, with whom they have diverse relationships of class, social hierarchy and social capital. Although JaF and Trotoart’s work does contain very strong nuances of advocating “on behalf of” the other (the *rakyat*), their participatory approaches and their spatial self-location allows us to frame their work within endogenous development theories.

Theoretical frameworks

Largely because we, the authors of this paper, come from separate academic backgrounds; those being urban anthropology and visual arts research-in-practice respectively, the theoretical frameworks we use in this paper are diverse and interdisciplinary. The underlying similarities and occasional cross overs relate to autonomous (artistic) practice within the state—specifically Indonesia—but we address

this through concepts around public space, urban planning, art practice as subversion or co-option of state authority, participatory or relational aesthetics, endogenous development and the practice of everyday life, whilst simultaneously maintaining a critical attitude to aspects of the current manifestation of these theories, which are outlined briefly below.

Urban Public space and art

Rossi sees the city as the sum of its architecture, which insists on an explanation of the city as an art object (Rossi, 1966). Artefacts of the city, like buildings, roads, urban furniture, and so on, are regarded as works of art that are believed to manifest from practice of daily, social life. In time, the artefacts of the city begin to change in function or form and possess a new meta character—as economic, socio-cultural visualisations—a form of art work. The city is spatial practice itself. Lefebvre’s thinking around the appropriation of space and its redirection or re-inscription are useful here, not least because he spans artistic practice and urban social practice (Lefebvre’s writings reflect on his intimate knowledge of Surrealist practice as well as philosophical approaches to urban living), but also because he views these as interconnected and mutually reflective. According to Lefebvre there are several levels of space, including planned physical space (absolute space) and more complex ‘social spaces’ where meaning is produced publicly (Lefebvre, 1991p.68-229). The appropriation of space is advocated by Lefebvre as a method for residents to claim their rights to urban life in the city, repurposing physical and social space in their own interests (Lefebvre 1996, p.179). Through appropriation, the 12 x 30 project becomes part of a lineage of artworks which have enacted appropriation as primary artistic practice, including the work of the Surrealists and International Situationists.

In the context of the practices of appropriation in Jatiwangi and

4 See Indonesia’s Coalition for Justice and Truth (KKPK) report on their “Year of Truth” documenting testimonies on violence and impunity in Indonesia.

Penjaringan, deep understanding of localised production of spatial meaning, gained through research and practice, is imperative for the implementation of social change. Social production can be intervened on through spatial change through the implementation of civic design and civic reform. Civil society, in this case the residents of Jatisura and Penjaringan, claims its right to urban space through the process of appropriation towards social change.

David Harvey (2001) develops Lefebvre's concept of the right to the city to address the marginalisation of communities in the city due to capitalist development. According to Harvey, what is achieved by these 'rebel' claims is greater democratic control over the production and exploitation of surplus capital. Both political and cultural (art-based) social movements intervene on control over the distribution of this production and distribution of surplus capital by 'taking back space', whether that space is conceptual (for instance 'authority') or physical (for instance unused space owned by corporations). Every intervention risks segregation from civil society, but the use of appropriate 'tactics' contributes significantly to the return of citizens rights to urban areas, especially public spaces. The tactics used in this case involve the activation of citizens through direct participation in the creative and/or conceptual process.

Participatory art, and the problem of the neo-conservative state

The three projects discussed in this paper are the kind much analysed in recent scholarship around what is variously called relational aesthetics (Bishop, 2004; Bourriaud, 1998), dialogical art (Bhabha, 1998; Kester, 2004, 2011), participatory art (Bishop, 2012, 2006) or earlier still, new genre public art (Lacy, 1995). There are of course a number of aspects within these discourses around art practice and the public which are relevant here, from the problems

of documentation versus aesthetic form, to the problems of defining and exploiting "communities." (Kwon, 2004, p.100-155) Two questions come to the fore in the context of JaF and Trotoart's work. The first lies within the debate around ameliorative or antagonistic participatory art practice and in particular, its relationship to the state or the *status quo*. The second emerges around ownership of localised physical and conceptual space and how artists work with/in that ownership.

Bishop points out that artists whose projects aim to ameliorate social problems, using participation to fill gaps where the state is absent, run the risk of fulfilling the agendas of neo-conservative governments who "seek to conceal social inequality, rendering it cosmetic (or biographic) rather than structural. She advocates antagonistic art practice, citing a number of projects that involved symbolic exploitation of participants as a method for drawing attention to the power relationships that lead to inequality. Kester, on the other hand, asserts that these projects merely mimic exploitation and become an experience of 'pleasure' for wealthy, educated audiences who, recognising the subversion and subscribing to the political perspective, are merely validated rather than challenged (Kester, 2011, p.63). This poses the question of how these semi-autonomous public art projects transgress on state authority and responsibility, and where this fits within the somewhat polarised debate around ameliorative or antagonistic art. (Bishop, 2012; Kester, 2011) (Bishop, 2004)

When artists consider the responsibilities of the state and the rights of its citizens, the resulting work tends to address a particular community. What constitutes a community and how these become the 'site' for site-specific art projects, is addressed in Kwon's analysis of public art in the United States (Kwon, 2004). This work provides a useful framework for understanding how

artists' relationships to the community as 'site' impacts on the work produced and the involvement of the public. JaF and Trotoart challenge assumptions about the temporality of long-term projects, but provide a case study in 'locational identity', in their case, they are artists who are genuinely of and from the place in which they 'site' their work.

Tactics and strategies

Michael De Certeau distinguishes between tactics and strategies in terms of time and space. The tactic, he argues, departs from no spatial or institutional localisation; these are the preserve of the strategy, which operates from its locale to establish relations with 'exteriors' (competitors, partners, opposition, etc.). "On the contrary, because it does not have a place, a tactic depends on time—it is always on the watch for opportunities that must be seized "on the wing". Whatever it wins it does not keep. It must constantly manipulate events in order to turn them into opportunities." (de Certeau, 1984, p. xix)

This concept provides a useful position from which to consider the different practices of art institutions, collectives and individuals, acknowledging the relative power differentials amongst these groups, even when they appear to be working with the same material in the same field. However, it is also challenged by the curatorial and creative processes observed during the institution of the Jakarta Biennale and associated projects (or exteriors), and by the tendency of the artist collectives under discussion here to work with the representatives of the state. Questions also emerge as to whether the 'site' of community based art that Kwon refers to can be regarded as a one of de Certeau's spatial locales, and whether the form of spatial locales need be abstract or concrete in order to generate strategic response. In a society like Indonesia, where '*siasat*' or tactics are a predominant and necessary response to the both the social and physical environment, are tactics part of a process that leads towards strategy?

Endogenous development and artist generated social capital

Endogenous development in the context of art practice in communities, in these cases at least, works as a systematic manifestation of capital accumulation, in particular social capital, because this is based on the localised capacity of that particular area/society. Social capital is an informal norm that occurs when there is motivation for cooperation amongst individuals (Fukuyama, 2001). It refers to the social and cultural cohesivity of the community; the norms and values that govern interaction between people and institutions that are unified within it. Putnam's (1993) concepts of social capital are the most influential, referring to the features of social organisations, such as trust, norms and networks that can heighten social effectivity by facilitating coordinated behaviour. Through participatory art practice JaF and Trotoart employ creative strategies to build social capital that is based on the capacities and potentials already in existence in their communities. The legitimisation of endogenous development leads to the autonomy to activate spaces or regions with locality as the primary social capital. Endogenous development involves autonomous discourse that aims to change the constructed order of society. Autonomy as activism for negation offers an understanding of the identity of local communities, using art practice that actually surpasses endogenous development itself (Prasetyo, 2014).

Festival Masa Depan

"Oh we just let them decide. We're just the little people, we're happy to just follow along."⁵ This paraphrases my first encounter with a Jatisura resident when I joined the first phase of the FMP, (Festival Masa Depan), which aimed to involve the local community in a process of mapping and imagining Jatiwangi ten years into

the future. As a distinctly foreign entity, albeit within a community accustomed to the presence of foreigners, I was an unimpressive candidate as a facilitator of participatory urban-planning. However, the response is instructive in several ways. It highlights several issues within the ideology of participation in general, and particularly in densely populated, poorly educated regions such as we find in many parts of rural Indonesia. The first is that indeed, as citizens of a modern democratic state—which functions on the basis of elected leadership and public service from ‘specialists’ in their various fields—we should be able to “leave it up to those who know better”. Conversely, especially in Indonesia, it is apparent that our representatives and public servants in the democratic state often in fact represent other, competing interests, such as capital, prestige, power and self-interest. In response to this, organisations such as JaF assume the role of mediators between those who know and those who need, through consistent autonomous and semi-autonomous activity.

Most instructive from this first attempt at facilitating participation in the project was the stark contrast between my experience, and the enthusiasm that Arief Yudi—co-founder of JaF and locally-born and raised—managed to garner from participants just a few hundred metres away. With Arief leading, approximately 40 people, divided into groups of women, men and children, were busily drawing up maps of their neighbourhoods, identifying sites of economic, social, cultural, religious and ‘other’ activities. It seemed clear that this was an exercise that required the kind of trust that has been built up over the preceding eight years, between the residents and the locally-based JaF team; it continues JaF’s attempts to provide opportunities for the Jatisura community (in Jatiwangi) to activate space through art networks, as a mode of citizen creativity. This is a claim for autonomy from state assignment of economic and cultural production is the centre of these activities.

Autonomy is usually defined as a working-process of self valorisation, negation of state power, or an alternative to forms of hegemonic development. In the context of JaF, it is associated with historical capital, cultural interaction and the economic sector: the ceramic industry that draws people into the centre of Jatiwangi’s social economic, political and cultural activity through art practice. Through the concept of guest–host relations, JaF aims to transcend the boundaries of art practice and promote the creation of art works that reflect the ideas, traditions and issues of the local community, combined with the ideas and artistic practices of the guest artists. Participants also traverse relational patterns across the traditional and modern, rural and urban, global and local and so forth.

As a tile-production area, Jatiwangi possesses considerable material/resource capital in the form of clay. But until recently, this material had only functioned as the basis for the production of one product, roof-tiles. JaF has innovated on this by diversifying their factory production to make musical instruments from clay, and also by using the roof-tiles to make unique-sounding instruments. This process of shifting the patterns of production in a community can also generate change by shifting the perspective of that community. JaF’s activation through art practice opens up new experiences for the community, revealing the potential for natural resources to be employed differently than they have been in the past. The new forms of musical instruments are not only for the purposes of the professional musicians within JaF, but also for the community’s own enjoyment. For instance, local children have become fond of using ocarinas crafted from clay and fired at JaF. On a larger scale JaF has held the Ceramic Music Festival, which, as well as featuring high profile Indonesian and international musicians, also involved over 1500 local residents in a percussion performance utilising roof-tiles.

This signifies that activating the public through existing resources from ordinary life (clay and roof-tiles) opens up new domains for development. On a social level, this art (music) practice works to raise social capital in Jatiwangi. Activism through participatory art practice gives rise to new identities without discarding former identities and their historicity. The spatial formation of the community's identity as a roof-tile producer is enhanced as new identities emerge within the Jatiwangi community. These adhere as contemporary identities of the Jatiwangi community, diversifying and strengthening the community.

Here we can see the practice of advocacy on behalf of the community returning its attention to its own neighbourhood, the local environment and the potentially homogenous effects of urbanisation. Jatisura in Jatiwangi has, through JaF, performed an elegant resistance by implementing counter culture through (participatory) art practice to look at and re-read its own identity.

The *Festival Masa Depan* was a collaborative project implemented over August and September 2013 by Rujak Urban Studies, an urban planning research organisation from Jakarta; a number of volunteers; and JaF; throughout the Jatisura hamlet. Although it may seem incongruous for an urban planning organisation to be involved in an area that is often described as a 'village', the reality is that Jatisura's population (6339 people in 2012 census) sits tightly alongside many other 'villages' that make up Jatiwangi subdistrict. Several tens of thousand people live here in close proximity to each other, many of whom are employed in tile making factories. However, rural life is never too far away, and farmers and farm labourers make up the majority of household heads. (Tri Irawaty, 2013)

The idea for the festival first emerged after Rujak founder, Marco

Kusumawijaya gave a presentation at JaF's regular Forum 27, held on the 27th of each month. From there it was agreed that Rujak and JaF and the local government (Jatisura *hamlet* level) would collaborate on a participatory urban planning research project.

The *Festival Masa Depan* was conducted in three phases; the *Festival of Vision*, the *Festival of Reality* and the *Festival of Change*. We, the authors of this paper, were most directly involved in the second stage, the *Festival of Reality*, but followed the first and third stages closely.

The *Festival of Vision* invited residents to imagine Jatisura ten years into the future. Conducted over two days in August, it generated 108 drawings made by residents, divided into groups of men, women and children. These divisions also influenced the form of the projections or desires for Jatiwangi's future, in perhaps predictable, gendered ways. Irawaty notes that the men of the village were more focused on infrastructure, farming machinery and modernised buildings, whilst the women produced visions of public facilities for health, education and collective recreation, as well as depicting an economic base centred on home industries. Interestingly, the children's drawing showed a very different Jatisura, evoking a more the rural version of the village with rice fields, trees, animal farms and flowing rivers, whilst teenagers also sought communal public facilities for sport and parks. One of the most fascinating incidents during the *Festival of Vision* occurred during the Forum 27, when residents were presenting their drawings and explaining their visions for the future further. Irawaty diplomatically mentions that various governmental representatives had involved themselves as 'observers' of the process; my field notes record a particularly interesting example of their involvement that occurred on the 27th of August.

6 Ellen Kent's field notes, Jatiwangi Art Factory, 27 August 2013.

7 Iriwaty quotes the Ministry for Interior's Regulation 51, 2007, regarding community based village-level development as stipulating in article 6.11 that spatial planning in villages should be conducted in a participatory manner. One imagines Focus Group Discussions to be a primary method of 'participation'.

8 The references to Sub-districts, villages and hamlets in this paper are based on standard translations of terms in the hierarchical Indonesian system of municipal division, and may not necessarily correspond to understandings of these words in other contexts.

9 Ellen Kent's field notes, Jatiwangi Art Factory, 7-8 September 2013

"As the night progressed, participants also had a chance to respond, and then grouped together to distil these ideas into four drawings describing their vision for the future of Jatisura. While I ducked out to phone home, a coup occurred. Government officials who had arrived late in the process (of the evening) and not participated in the drawing process suddenly announced their intention to describe the results of their latest survey and planning for "20 years into the future of Jatisura." A projector and screen appeared, some aerial maps (were) displayed and suddenly JaF's Festival Masa Depan turned into the "*Fokus Grup Diskusi (FGD) & Jaring Apsirasi Masyarakat (JASMARA), Pedoman Penataan Ruang Kawasan Perdesaan*" (Focus Groups Discussion and Catchment for Society's Aspirations, A Directive on Spatial Planning in the Village), the first slide indicating the '*Tipologi Desa Industri Sedang dan Besar (Studi Kasus Desa Jatisura)*' (Typology of Medium and Large Industrial Villages (Case Study Jatisura))"⁶

This incident, which according to members of JaF mirrored others that had been occurring more frequently as the parliamentary and presidential elections drew closer, provides an excellent study in the conditions that lead to the reality experienced by community artists in Britain in the 1980s, whereby they became "quasi-employees" of dominant state agencies. In that instance, "co-option by the state shifted community art into the position of social provision.... rather than community empowerment fomenting and supporting campaigns for social justice." (Bishop, 2012) p.188) In the incident at JaF, Arief Yudi immediately asserted control over the event, calling out the government officials for hijacking the event and interrupting an activity that was designed for citizens to be heard, not spoken to. What is most interesting about JaF's version of community participation (exemplified in *Festival Masa Depan*) is that in the

contemporary Indonesian political context, community participation is viewed as an 'opportunity' for the authorities to co-opt artistic practice to be used as participation in their own processes⁷—by turning a community based and run creative exercise into a Focus Group Discussion—but is simultaneously viewed by artists as an opportunity for antagonism, by inviting authorities to participate only as passive observers, to overtly reject their 'expertise', and to demonstrate the potential of genuine community involvement in planning.

The *Festival of Reality* took place a little over a week later in early September, and involved villagers in mapping the current state of the area. Planning jargon around 'village potential' was exchanged for the more dramatic "village secrets", aiming to identify a distinct character for each of the five hamlets contained in the village.⁸ This process, the facilitation of which was divided up amongst a group of volunteers including the authors, took two days to complete. This was our opportunity to view the behind-the-scenes machinations, briefing, debriefing and planning behind the implementation of community participation. Approximately 15 volunteers set out to gather residents for the construction of maps, with instructions from Marco and Arief for each group to focus on one hamlet, and map formal and informal sites of economic production, social interaction, unused land, etc. Referring to field notes from the day, frustration is evident with regards to the apparent lack of interest in, or intention to, invite other residents participation in the process. Our group, including two locals and three outsiders, finally ended up referring to the town hall map, which was reproduced as the final output; a 'formalised and notated map'⁹. On day two we set out again with depleted personnel, having been gently instructed to try harder! With the assistance of Ginggi (Pak Kuwu, the village head) we found ourselves

directed to the front porch of the Manis Hamlet RT (lowest administrative level, responsible for 'neighbourhood harmony') officer. In spite of our continuous attempts, we were unable to garner the participation of any of the other residents passing by. Nonetheless our source managed to produce a respectable, locally sourced map with our encouragement, and we were able to attend the evening debriefing with our heads held high. Late that afternoon, the local creators of the maps were again asked to present their findings, and promote the 'secrets' of their neighbourhood. Thus Pon became a centre for sport and health due to its fields and health care professionals, Wates the centre of cultural, social and religious activity due to its large community space, and so on. The final phase of the festival was dedicated to a rigorous planning strategy, in which residents were encouraged to stage the process towards their planning vision by creating realistic two year goals, moving backwards from 2023 to 2014.

Throughout the process of the Festival Masa Depan we witnessed a surprisingly sophisticated, yet risky, process of engaging with the local community to identify its own strengths and desires, which is at the core of endogenous development theory. The process also built on a key tenet of endogenous development; the production of social capital. In this context artists are uniquely placed to develop social capital by playing between the roles of antagonist and authority. The involvement of Jatisura's village and subdistrict heads in JaF's program—which is enabled by the artists' own profiles and open, inclusive practices—lends legitimacy and authority to their goals and bridges the gap with residents who are unused to genuine participation. On the other hand, their creative and low-key/low-fi approaches (in stark contrast to the PowerPoint's and brochures *Dinas* as illustrated on Rujak's blog) clearly identify their autonomy from

the state. Big-city intellectuals, artists and university students are welcome in Jatisura, but they are implicitly positioned horizontally to local residents, and it is compulsory to work with the community when working at JaF. This is a risky strategy, as was evident during the implementation of the Festival Masa Depan, because there is no guarantee that artists and intellectuals are in any way equipped to deliver genuine participation. In the end however, this is why JaF is an arts organisation and not a socially engaged NGO. In art, the risk of failure, and indeed failure itself, is an acceptable part of the creative process and feeds the success of output. Art is a site for experimentation, and it is clear from the response and involvement by local government officials that the state views these experiments as pathways to the development of potential state programs.

'Siasat'—Artistic Tactics for Transgression on State Authority

The Penjaringan area is well known for reasons other than creative use of public space. Every year or two, when heavy rain falls for more than a few days in a row, Penjaringan, in North Jakarta, floods. Local and international media broadcasts images of residents moving to upper floors, into neighbours' houses, away to relatives, or simply living with it until the flood waters recede. The 12x30m project told a different story, with artists' collective Trotoart collaborating with JaF to exploit a major exhibition opportunity to create a permanent, dynamic, public space, a tactic that fits and complicates established theories around artists' relationships to civic and state responsibilities.

Tactics in City Spaces

Rossi's understanding of the city as a summary of its architecture emphasises the role of social practice in determining meaning for city spaces, and the role of different stakeholders, including residents, in

redesigning these spaces to enact social change. While Rossi's vision of the city as an artefact of social practice imagines the city as a site for social negotiation, in reality the city often reflects very little of its inhabitants' desires or values, with citizens distinctly disempowered in their relationship to the state's formation of the city. Increasingly, the influences of corporate capital shape the city's private and public spaces.

Harvey's framework around the right to the city (Harvey, 2001) responds precisely to the situations that are reflected in Penjaringan and other areas of Jakarta. Here changes in the city, as conducted by civil society, implement 'city tactics' through interventions that take back city space. Trotoart's activities in this arena have spanned conceptual spaces of education, recreation and creative expression in the past, in efforts to involve the residents of Penjaringan directly in the manifestation of self-determined values. *12x30m* represented a concrete expression of these claims. This is the starting point for the 'right to the city;' society's participation in implementing tactics towards the development of the city. Thus emerges a new political perspective for opposing neo-liberal urban development processes like the privatisation of urban space, the commercialisation of the city spaces and the domination of industrial and trading areas.

The concept of ideal public space does not only to speak of the interests of particular groups or communities, but is focussed on the venues for social activities that represent every visitor or viewer, in spite of the abstract nature of the concept of public space for each social individual. Public space is a mediator for all sorts of communication, including the realm of promotion, but more deeply it is for exchange and synergising different forms of ideology, art and culture. Art activity in public space provides opportunities

for communities or individuals to participate in the formation of social meaning for public space.

Adopting tactics as a strategy: Art and Public space

The 15th Jakarta Biennale's adoption of urban 'tactics' as a curatorial concept adds an interesting element to De Certeau's understanding, one which points to the paradoxical nature of the role of socially engaged art in the world today. The Biennale is run and funded by a long-standing Jakarta establishment, the DKJ, or Jakarta Arts Board. This board itself has over the years drawn some members from artist run initiative, *ruangrupa*, who are now part of the establishment and conducted almost the entire running of the 2013 Biennale. This is a normal progression in the arts, from fringe to core, alternative to establishment. The paradox emerges specifically within the articulation of the curatorial concept. I quote Ade Darmawan's introduction to the Biennale's catalogue: *"In recent years, it is becoming more urgent to revisit and re-examine the position of the public in the planning and development of the city.....Many urban dwellers thrive despite the absence of the state, and some of them have been contributing to the life of the city.... To encourage sophistication of these sporadic and speculative practices, we need to see them with a critical eye, to re-arrange, formulate, and make them more expandable, spreadable, and locally adaptable."* (Darmawan, 2013)

From this we might extrapolate that what the organisers of the Biennale hope to achieve is, in fact, the locating of these tactics. From their institutionalised position, the Biennale has adopted tactics as its strategy; tactics (or more precisely the tacticians) become the "exteriors" to the Biennale's 'proper', and through the process of 're-arrangement, expansion and adaptation' they become absorbed into that institution. The risk is of course that the very aspect of the tactician's existence that the Biennale

seeks to identify might well be lost through the process of identification. However, it would be remiss to see the Biennale's exteriors as merely passive art objects within a curatorial theme. Instead, what occurred at least in Trotoart and JaF's case (according to Jhonni Partiakik), was the utilisation of the theme to fit the needs of the Penjaringan community. During a meeting with ruangrupa and DKJ, the *siasat* theme was raised. Immediately Jhoni was reminded of the often expressed desire of Penjaringan residents to have a football field, and the Jakarta Biennale's theme, and of course funding, provided the opportunity, ready for seizing, to realise this desire.

12x30m as a spatial tactic or strategy; exploiting the convolutions of bureaucracy

JaF and Trotoart have met on occasion since around 2011, usually under the auspices of ruangrupa in one capacity or another. They have both been involved in ruangrupa's *Gerobak Bioskop* (Mobile Cinema) program, as hosts and contributors. Their project for the 15th Jakarta Biennale was called *12 x 30 di Sebelah Kecepatan* (*12 x 30 Beside the Speed*). In this context, JaF's relatively greater success in advocacy through endogenous (development) art practice denoted them the role of mentor; a reversal of the usual hierarchical relationship between the centre and the periphery, rural and city. It also inverted their residency program by placing their members in a different local context with the imperative of making work in accord with local desires. Together the two initiatives appropriated a contested space in Penjaringan's Kampung Baru Kubur Koja area, for the building of a futsal field. This multi-ethnic, multi-cultural area lies alongside and underneath the toll road that leads to Jakarta's international airport.

The Jakarta Biennale website features a blog, with an extensive description of the lifestyles and pressures on the

neighbourhood that is inhabited by two distinct groups that rarely come together: the legal residents of the administrative area "RW 15", who occupy the overcrowded rented housing, and the illegal squatters who have built a haphazard community (including a billiard hall and a musholla) underneath the toll road. This community is not only vulnerable to flood. The extremely close housing and the lack of cooking facilities means cooking is often done on balconies and can easily cause fires. The ethnic and religious makeup of the area is mixed but the more obvious difference exists (as observed by the blog writers, including JaF member Loranita Theo) between the administrative residents and the squatters who occupy the space under the bridge. The former are active 24 hours a day, laying claim to the private and public spaces, small though they may be. The squatters are described as being constrained by a "fence of psychological barbed wire." (Theo & Harisetiawan, 2013)

The space in question lies in between these two groups; a space that should—according to the usual agreements between the city and the toll road company—be used for general or social facilities. Undeveloped by the government either at a municipal level or under the direction of the neighbourhood 'RT/RW', whose role it is to represent the government locally, the space became a rubbish dump and a car park, run for profit by local *preman*.¹⁰ According to representatives of Trotoart, prior to the implementation of *12x30m*, various government staff and apparatus had attempted to clear the rubbish from the land and wrest control from the *preman*, but had failed. Jhoni described his approach as "entering as they are", a kind of chameleon approach involving acting like a *preman* with *preman*, like a bureaucrat with bureaucrats, like a squatter with squatters.

"In front of the suburb leader I said: 'Trotoart isn't the riot police, we're not the army, not the police and we're

¹⁰ *Preman* is the term used to refer to the 'criminal class' that are deeply enmeshed and controlling of many aspects of life in Indonesian cities, from traffic control to extra-military activity. See (Lindsey, 2001) and (Kristiansen, 2003)

not a gang, this isn't our job; but with God's will we could calm them...'Our system humanised them, with a persuasive, educative and dialogical approach. So the government backed down, they were embarrassed."¹¹

Over a few short days in the beginning of November 2013, residents of Penjaringan worked together with JaF, Trotoart, NEVIL and EXOTIC to clear the 12 x 30 meter space. Local government cleanliness officers were persuaded to take away rubbish and pose for photos. Goals were erected at either end, and the whole field was surrounded by a bamboo fence to keep the ball from flying into homes (this task was reserved for Jatiwangi artists, among whose members there are professional bamboo craftsmen). Then overnight, it was covered with concrete surface. Opening night was celebrated with the premiere of a film, *Bangunin Sahur*, made by Trotoart under the mentorship of JaF. JaF's collective of skilled multi-media artists were also responsible for the creation of video and installation works which constituted part of the 'documentation' of the process. Unlike many other archival or documentary works which accompany participatory projects, however, these works instead profiled each of Trotoart and JaF members and some other Penjaringan residents. The profiles were presented in the format of a sports video game introduction, listing their strengths, weaknesses and special 'tactics' as futsal players in animations which layered over footage of the individuals during the project's implementation. When I visited some days after the opening I found members of JaF still hard at work completing their part of the project, the erection of a bamboo fence to protect squatters from flying balls.

"They were all crying; they were so happy," Jhoni enthused of the residents when I visited the 12x30m site in December 2013. Jhoni explained to me the dual function of the futsal field as a conceptual space and a physical space. The physical benefits were clear; children and adults had a space to play in, and due to its construction by a third "non-administrative" party or parties, it was equally accessible by those living under the bridge and those in the official neighbourhood. For Trotoart, the field has equally important symbolic function as an example, set for neighbourhood government representatives (RT, RW) who have neglected to develop any designated public recreation spaces even where it is, as in this site, the intended function of the space. Trotoart's tactic was to build social capital by exploiting its network of artists and its relationship to the institution of the Jakarta Biennale, in order to build a functional 'social facility' and exposing (some of) the local RW/RT's inability to do the same. The ultimate goal is to benefit the residents, and this is realised through ongoing programming on the site. The ongoing program has also served to develop a sense of ownership amongst the local community. When I visited in June 2014, the bright orange witch's hats designated it as a no parking area. These weren't placed there by Trotoart; local youngsters had assigned themselves the task of protecting the autonomy of the space for community use, and policed this with zeal. In effect, the artist's initiatives have here become the authority. So how does this complicate De Certeau's assertion on the fleeting benefits of the tactician's gains?

Neo-conservative strategies and public art: devolving responsibility?

Bishop points out that artists whose projects aim to ameliorate social problems, using participation to fill gaps where the state is absent, run the risk of fulfilling the agendas of neo-conservative governments who "seek to conceal social inequality, rendering it cosmetic (or biographic) rather than structural." (Bishop, 2012, p.13) Might the same paradigm apply in Jakarta in 2013?

It seems clear that the divestment of state responsibility for community welfare has long been returned to the community itself in Indonesia. Successive governments

have focussed on embedding the concept of *gotong royong*, or reciprocal assistance, into constructions of Indonesian national identity. (Bowen, 1986, p. 454-561) In fact, according to legislation, the RT/RW are responsible for the "Creation of concepts in the implementation of development by building the aspirations and independence of the community (and the) Motivation of independent *gotong royong* and community participation in their area."¹²

In the context of *12x30m*, the artists have not only taken on the roles specifically designated to RW/RT, but they have done so with the financial support of an institution (the Biennale) that answers to the Jakarta Arts Board, which has since 1968 been a "working partner" of the Governor of Jakarta City District. The artist initiatives have become, through the Biennale process, less tacticians in urban intervention than they are 'exteriors' to the Biennale's established and self-determined strategies for expanding their practices. They are indeed agents of the state, funded and encouraged by its apparatus; but at the same time they seek to undermine the authority of localised state agents by usurping their roles, drawing attention to their disfunctionality. In Indonesia's convoluted, immensely hierarchical and hugely bureaucratic civil service, theoretical concerns about the potential for these kinds of programs to conceal social inequalities are complicated. Further complications emerge through the participation of the illegal residents, who are otherwise excluded from the activities of local administrators (Theo & Harisetiawan, 2013) yet here become active participants in the reclaiming and development of space for 'social facility'. It is hard to say whether this disguises the structural inequalities that lead to their social exclusion, or draws the attention of a broader public to them. Could in fact both be the result?

Dignity with Trotoart; activating public space

As De Certeau asserts, tactics, like those implemented by Trotoart in *12x30m*, require no firm base and instead seize opportunities as they arise. But if we accept that *12x30m* was a tactical manoeuvre, seizing the opportunity provided by a large scale exhibition and manipulating the event in order to fill a gap left by ill-equipped neighbourhood authorities, then the assertion that whatever is won through tactics cannot be kept must be questioned. Trotoart and JaF's tactics in fact resulted in a concrete spatial adjustment in the Penjaringan neighbourhood, one that continues to provide a locale from which Trotoart has been able to solidify its activities. Based on the existence of the *12x30m* futsal field, Trotoart has developed a 12 month program of weekly, monthly and annual activities; the program is titled *Bertmartabat Bersama Trotoart* (Dignity with Trotoart). Early every Sunday morning around three hundred local women gather for *senam*; aerobic exercises led by a charismatic and colourful local enthusiast. In the afternoon, children from Penjaringan gather on the field for the 'Learning and Teaching English' and 'painting for kids' program. Saturday nights see the space turn into an outdoor cinema, part of the Gerobak Bioskop program also initiated by ruangrupa.¹³ The logistical aspects and costs of running these programs is largely born by the artists and assisted through in-kind support, with organisations (such as, again, ruangrupa) lending audio visual and other equipment. Trotoart is attempting to gain a more solid financial base through t-shirt production and merchandise, but there is no funding from local or regional government. Jhonni professed his gratitude to the regional government (*Pemda*) for their support; when pressed for details over what form that support took, it becomes apparent that this is in the form of a good relationship in terms of getting permission to run their events. It is easy, and perhaps necessary, to be cynical about the good-will of the government in this case. Essentially Trotoart is providing the kind of social services rarely available to communities in this disadvantaged part of Jakarta. In an area known for its low incomes and social vulnerability,¹⁴ regional governments would

12 Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri no. 5/2007 : BAB IV : JENIS, Pasal 15 (my translation)
 13 For more information on Gerobak Bioskop, see <http://update.ruangrupa.org/2014/program-pemutaran-beisama-gerobak-bioskop/>
 14 A 2014 newspaper article reported that the Regional Government (*Pemda*) had identified Penjaringan as one of the top 10 most vulnerable communities in Jakarta, particularly in terms of health. See ((CR-41), 2014)

15 Interview with Jhonni Patriark and Peter, 17 July 2014. The research presented in this paper primarily took place over July 2013–July 2014, a period in which two major national elections and hundreds of local elections took place. The presidential election in particular saw distinctly different patterns of citizen engagement with the democratic process, and this included autonomous efforts of organisations and individuals to persuade non-voters to participate through widespread viral social media campaigns. Anecdotally, this social pressure received a mixed reception, as some Indonesians see abstention as an act of political resistance within a corrupt system. Voting is not compulsory in Indonesia, and in 2014 turnout was just over 70%, slightly down on 2009 election's 73%.

16 Interview with Jhonni Patriark and Peter, 17 July 2014

17 Ibid

no doubt be pleased that programs are being provided with their 'support' and yet require no provision of funding, expertise oversight or qualitative assessment. This is not something Trotoart are unaware of. During our last interview the final, difficult question posed was "Do artists like Trotoart, unintentionally, in their generosity, actually assist the government to avoid its responsibilities?" Jhoni's response listed a litany of incompetency, corruption and bureaucratic burden that stands between the government programs that Jhoni believes do exist, and their implementation. He alleges that fictional organisations are established to receive funds apparently for these kinds of activities, which then never occur. Referring to the *senam* program, including the cost of making t-shirts for participants, for which Trotoart has incurred a debt, Jhoni says: Stuff like this is not my job. It's not Trotoart's job. Whose job is it? It's the RT, the RW, the suburb-head, the sub-district, the district, the mayor, the governor, the state, the government! Why am I doing it? So, because of this, there is a disparity that means the value of citizens cannot only be measured when they vote. It makes me mad."¹⁵ Nonetheless Trotoart, through its figure-head Jhoni, continues to maintain a cordial relationship with local and regional representatives of the government; amongst the data Trotoart has shared for this research are photos of members of the collective greeting then Jakarta Governor, and now President of the Republic of Indonesia, Joko Widodo.

As with JaF, from whom Trotoart have learned much during this process, the involvement or support from government representatives lends their project the legitimacy on which to build social capital. The recent legal recognition of Trotoart as a foundation, the Yayasan Trotoart Semesta Raya is also a further attempt to legitimise their activities and strengthen their position with current and potential stakeholders. It is clear that the 12x30m project has had far reaching effects

on the circumstances and goals of Trotoart, but Jhoni remains adamant that the organisation will not allow itself become involved with the bureaucracy or its apparatus in the way that JaF has; in fact he claims to have already rejected a nomination to become RT.¹⁶ In spite of its shift from tactician to strategist, Jhoni maintains that Trotoart remains subversive due to its very nature as an art collective. He claims that there are only two components that can destroy the state; artists and the military. "The state is afraid of artists and the military. Messing around with those two components is very dangerous. In 1998 there were lots of kidnappings. Who did they kidnap? Thirteen Indonesian artists! Who brought down Suharto, Gus Dur, who? Artists and the military....political experts, sorry...they're just blabbering....they're oriented to the personal, the material, the economic. Trotoart, we target the people."¹⁷

Conclusion

The occupation and activation of public space by artists is an effort to take back expressive space and review what its intention should be; it is a claim that public space is not for commercialisation by corporate interests and is not only for the use of the government. More than that, JaF and Trotoart attempts to build a reality where the function of public space is returned to the public through creative practice led by local, resident artists, with the direct participation of local residents—either in the imagining of conceptual space, in the physical appropriation of concrete space, or perhaps in both. Urban-rural connectivity as a network of production and reproduction of public space, in this case is an expansion of geo-spatial (not administrative) cities, through process of occupancy and advocacy. Hence from the perspective of the city's spatial structure, the landscape of city space becomes the material for a dialectic between the everyday practices of residents who depend on the city as the space of their lives.

What emerges is dynamic public space as a key to the process of contemporary urban development. It is space as work, not only as geography but as practice, meaning that it is not a physical space given, but a space which results from and lives through the actions of people. By leading these actions in Penjaringan and Jatiwangi Trotoart and JaF have co-opted the role of the state, with a tactical approach that exploits (and may in turn be exploited by) external entities such as institutions of art, governance or mediation, in order to imagine and realise public space that is artwork, rather than an art work for public space.

In spite of these similarities, however, there are fundamental, and sometimes paradoxical differences in their approaches. Although they appear to be more enmeshed in the state system than Trotoart, by virtue of the direct involvement of government representatives, JaF retain the artists' prerogative to undertake experimental, process based explorations of participation through a constantly evolving calendar of festival projects, in part influenced by the diverse array of artists in residence that come through. Trotoart by contrast is working hard to develop the legitimacy of the 12x30m space for residents use by providing regular, predictable and intentional programming that is only tangentially related to creative expression in the community, is more pedagogic than participatory, yet stridently rejects opportunities to involve themselves in 'the system' more deeply or directly. JaF and Trotoart challenge the assumption that ameliorative art practices and antagonism towards the state are incompatible. With the direct assistance of citizen stakeholders, they are reclaiming the diverse rights of democratic society, and exposing their lack in the process. It is a double edged sword.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bhabha, H. Conversational Art. In *Conversations at the Castle: Changing Audiences and Contemporary Art* edited by M. J. Jacob : MIT Press, Massachusetts, 1998
- Bishop, C. *Antagonism and relational aesthetics*. *October*, 51-79. 2004
- . (Ed.). *Participation (documents of contemporary art)*: The MIT Press, 2006
- . *Artificial Hells; Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso, 2012
- Bourriaud, N. *Relational Aesthetics* (2010 ed.). Paris: Le Presses du Réel, 1998
- Bowen, J. R. On the political construction of tradition: gotong royong in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, 45(03), 545-561, 1986.
- Darmawan, A. Siasat, an Introduction. In *Katalog 15th Jakarta Biennale 2013* (pp. 8-11) edited by A. Yunanto Jakarta: Dewan Kesenian Jakarta, 2013.
- de Certeau, M. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984.
- Fukuyama, F. Social Capital, Civil Society, and Development. *Third World Quarterly*, 22, no. 2, (2001)
- Harvey, D. *Spaces of Capital : Towards a Critical Political Geography*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2001.
- Holt, C. *Art in Indonesia: continuities and change*: Cornell University Press Ithaca, NY. 1967
- Kester, G. H. *Conversation piece : community and communication in modern art*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.
- Kester, G. H. *The one and the many : contemporary collaborative art in a global context*. Durham (N.C.): Duke University Press, 2011.
- Kristiansen, S. "Violent youth groups in Indonesia: the cases of Yogyakarta and Nusa Tenggara Barat" *Sojourn: Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*, pp. 110-138, 2003.
- Kwon, M. *One place after another: Site-specific art and locational identity*: The MIT Press, 2004.

- Lacy, S. (Ed.) *Mapping the terrain: new genre public art*. Bay Press, 1995.
- Lefebvre, H. *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Oxford, Blackwell, 1991
- Lindsey, T. "The criminal state: premanisme and the new Indonesia" *Indonesia Today. Challenges of History*, 283-297, 2001.
- Miklouho-Maklai, B. *Exposing society's wounds, some aspects of contemporary art since 1966*. Adelaide: Flinders University of South Australia, 1991
- Prasetyo, F. *Art, Activism and Endogenous Development Strategy*. Equator Symposium. Yayasan Biennale Yogyakarta. Universitas Gadjah Mada. 2014
- Putnam, R. *Making Democracy Work*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1993
- Rossi, A. *The Architecture of The City*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1966
- Sinar Harapan Online*. "Tingkat Kerawanan Paling Tinggi Tersebar di 10 Kelurahan" 4 March 2014
<http://sinarharapan.co/news/read/33347/tingkat-kerawanan-paling-tinggi-tersebar-di-10-kelurahan> (accessed 4 December 2014)
- Theo, L., & Harisetiawan, T. "Project 12 X 30 M Persegi di Sebelah Kecepatan: Memaksimalkan Ruang dan Potensi Tanpa Konflik." (The 12 X 30 M Square Metres Beside the Speed: Maximising Space and Potential Without Conflict) 2013
<http://disebelahkecepatan.jakartabiennale.net/project-12-x-30-m2-di-sebelah-kecepatan/> (accessed 4 December 2014)
- Tri Irawaty, D. (2013). Festival Masa Depan: Desa Jatisura 10 tahun ke Depan. Retrieved from <http://rujak.org/2014/04/festival-masa-depan-desa-jatisura-10-tahun-ke-depan/> (accessed 4 December 2014)

Peraturan dan perundangan

- Peraturan Daerah No 1 (2009). *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah 2007-2012*. Jakarta
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri no. 5/2007 : BAB IV : JENIS, Pasal 15

Ellen Kent,
 College of Arts and Social Sciences School of Art, Australia National University
 AUSTRALIA
 ellydotkent@gmail.com

Frans Ari Prasetyo,
 Research Team at Wilfrid Laurier University and the University of Toronto.
 Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council.
 CANADA
 fransariprasetyo@gmail.com

ISBN 978-602-73908-0-5

